

श्री अजय माकन: महोदय, यह बहुत अच्छा सजेशन माननीय सदस्या का है। वैसे मैं सदन को आपके माध्यम से बताना भी चाहूंगा कि एम.सी.डी. में आलरेडी इसके ऊपर एक कमेटी बैठाई हुई है और यह कमेटी तमाम टेक्निकल पैरामीटरज के अलावा distance between uni-poles, mode of display, contents of display, इन सब चीजों की वह जरूर छानबीन करता है लेकिन हम लोग खुद दिल्ली में रहकर के देखते हैं कि बहुत बार जो चीज होनी चाहिए उस हिसाब से नहीं हो पाती और कंटेंट के अंदर कई बार कमी रह जाती है। तो मैं माननीया सदस्या को विश्वास दिलाता हूं कि इनका बहुत अच्छा सुझाव है और इसको हम जरूर कंसिडर करेंगे।

### **Performance of States under MPLADS**

**\*226. SHRI URKHAO GWRA BRAHMA:** Will the Minister of STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION be pleased to state:

(a) the list of States giving good performance and poor performance in the implementation of MPLADS fund since its inception;

(b) the reasons for poor performance and measures to improve the same;

(c) the steps to make the administration more active for speedy disposal at the district level; and

(d) the decision if any to enhance the total yearly allocation of Rupees two crore fund under MPLADS?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRI G.K. VASAN): (a) to (d) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

### **Statement**

(a) and (b) The physical and financial performance of MPLAD Scheme is very good. Since inception upto 30.11.2006, the overall percentage of utilization over release is 88.77% and the percentage of works completed to works sanctioned is 89.47%. Lists indicating the financial performance of States and UTs. and their ranking in terms of utilization of funds over release and works completed over works sanctioned are given at enclosed Statement-I and II respectively. As per the details in the Statements, it is found that States and UTs. are performing well.

(c) The Government of India closely monitors the implementation status of the Scheme through regular financial and physical progress reports received from the Districts, works inspections conducted by District Collectors and Implementing Agencies.

The Guidelines on MPLADS provide for constitution of a Committee under the Chairmanship of the Chief Secretary/Development Commissioner/ Additional Chief Secretary to review MPLADS implementation progress with the district authorities and MPs at least once a year. State Level Monitoring Committees have been set up in some States/UTs. and other have also been requested to do the same.

The Guidelines also stipulate that the District Authority shall inspect at least 10% of the works under implementation every year. It is also the responsibility of the officers of the Implementing Agencies to regularly visit the work spots to ensure that works are progressing satisfactorily, as per the prescribed procedure, specifications and time schedule. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation holds regular review meetings with the officers of the State Governments for the smooth, speedy and effective implementation of the Scheme.

(d) At present, there is no proposal to increase the yearly allocation of Rs. 2 crore per Member of Parliament for MPLAD Scheme.

#### **Statement-I**

#### **Release of Funds/Expenditure in MPLADS indicating Ranking of States/UTs as on 30.11.2006**

(Rs. in crore)

State	Released by G.O.I	Amount available with Nodal District with Interest etc.	Amount sanctioned	Expenditure incurred	%Utilisation over released	Ranking
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Chandigarh	19.05	19.60	19.30	19.26	101.08	1
D & N Haveli	22.05	22.68	29.13	21.50	97.52	2
Arunachal Pradesh	65.15	65.87	62.64	62.47	95.88	3
Mizoram	42.10	42.39	42.67	40.19	95.47	4
Tamil Nadu	1194.35	1221.16	1193.85	1131.28	94.72	5
Nagaland	40.10	40.17	37.10	37.10	92.52	6

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Madhya Pradesh	841.60	858.21	823.48	778.45	92.50	7
A & N Islands	21.05	21.57	19.47	19.47	92.49	8
Karnataka	809.00	829.84	794.61	747.91	92.45	9
Pondicherry	34.10	36.37	41.16	31.42	92.14	10
Rajasthan	716.25	727.76	712.48	657.93	91.60	11
Assam	437.55	445.92	414.43	395.64	90.42	12
Goa	58.15	60.82	58.52	52.45	90.20	13
Andhra Pradesh	1238.45	1263.11	1239.25	1115.72	90.09	14
Meghalaya	64.15	64.82	58.21	57.63	89.84	15
Maharashtra	1294.75	1341.31	1356.79	1161.73	89.73	16
Chhattisgarh	314.65	319.24	297.51	282.28	89.71	17
Kerala	538.95	568.06	588.13	481.98	89.43	18
Tripura	62.15	62.44	59.98	55.14	88.72	19
Gujarat	748.35	766.90	733.87	663.66	88.68	20
Haryana	304.25	310.51	289.48	269.12	88.45	21
Punjab	412.55	419.69	393.79	363.77	88.18	22
West Bengal	1075.85	1101.96	1051.87	948.33	88.15	23
Himachal Pradesh	142.30	145.22	134.54	124.71	87.64	24
Daman & Diu	21.05	21.11	22.24	18.44	87.60	25
Uttar Pradesh	2324.20	2350.79	2169.38	2026.52	87.19	26
Uttaranchal	151.25	153.31	142.62	131.74	87.10	27
Lakshadweep	17.05	18.63	17.26	14.59	85.54	28
Orissa	635.00	644.57	592.70	537.80	84.69	29
Delhi	174.00	178.24	168.35	146.55	84.22	30
Jharkhand	359.75	364.88	325.77	302.59	84.11	31
Manipur	66.15	66.58	60.01	55.16	83.39	32
Sikkim	42.10	42.68	38.00	34.56	82.10	33
Bihar	1135.40	1151.86	1011.47	920.99	81.12	34
Jammu & Kashmir	170.80	173.56	161.05	136.12	79.70	35
<b>Total:</b>	<b>15595.65</b>	<b>15921.81</b>	<b>15161.10</b>	<b>13844.21</b>	<b>88.77</b>	

**Statement-II****Physical performance of States/UTs under MPLADS (as on 30.11.2006)**

State/UT	Number of Works			Percentage of works completed to sanctioned	Ranking
	Recommended by MPs	Sanctioned by District Authorities	Completed		
Andaman & Nicobar	644	642	642	100.00	1
Nagaland	1641	1611	1598	99.19	2
Arunachal Pradesh	1916	1715	1666	97.14	3
Mizoram	3302	3302	3174	96.12	4
Tamil Nadu	62143	59333	56220	94.75	5
Sikkim	775	775	730	94.19	6
Haryana	29309	25019	23332	93.26	7
Uttar Pradesh	121759	110182	102702	93.21	8
Jharkhand	19457	16429	15216	92.62	9
Chhattisgarh	31653	23491	21719	92.46	10
Madhya Pradesh	72878	61352	56712	92.44	11
Orissa	69883	64211	59341	92.42	12
Rajasthan	59878	56064	51576	91.99	13
Meghalaya	4202	3991	3671	91.98	14
Gujarat	88798	75885	69724	91.88	15
Delhi	6174	6166	5576	90.43	16
Uttaranchal	12475	12139	10916	89.93	17
Pondicherry	1602	1018	905	88.90	18
Assam	37438	36656	32329	88.20	19
Tripura	1320	1313	1158	88.19	20
Andhra Pradesh	96515	91519	80424	87.88	21
Daman & Diu	1247	512	449	87.70	22
Bihar	54792	41750	36221	86.76	23
Karnataka	44819	42754	37028	86.61	24
Maharashtra	75160	49505	42298	85.44	25
West Bengal	55695	53490	45209	84.52	26
Punjab	51967	50133	42359	84.49	27
Kerala	21605	18293	15424	84.32	28
Manipur	4747	4493	3758	83.64	29
D & N Haveli	1155	1036	865	83.49	30
Jammu & Kashmir	9893	9057	7162	79.08	31
Chandigarh	1136	688	500	72.67	32
Goa	930	709	510	71.93	33
Himachal Pradesh	17365	16866	11816	70.06	34
Lakshadweep	69	23	14	60.87	35
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1064342</b>	<b>942122</b>	<b>842944</b>	<b>89.47</b>	

**SHRI URKHAO GWRA BRAHMA:** Sir, first of all I would like to thank the hon. Minister for giving a detailed reply regarding performance of MPLADS funds. The reply says that the performance of the MPLADS funds in every State is satisfactory. As of today the release is 88.77 per cent and completion of work is 69.47 per cent. But this is not so in reality because if we see the implementation at the ground level, no effective mechanism for monitoring of the schemes is available here. The State-level Committees never convene meetings. In the last two years, in Assam, no meeting has been convened either by the Chief Secretary or the concerned authority to review the whole thing. In fact, MPs are blamed for not being able to spend the money. So, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he would evolve a new, effective mechanism to ensure proper and complete implementation of the MPLADS funds in all the States.

**SHRI G.K. VASAN:** Sir, through you, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Member to Annexure I of the main reply. It will be clearly seen that 79.70 per cent is the level of utilization over the funds released, and this is in respect of the 35th ranking State amongst all the States and Union Territories. It would also be seen that works completed against sanctioned is 60.87 per cent; this is again in respect of the 35th ranking State. So, when there is 60.87 per cent physical and 79.70 per cent financial performance in respect of the last ranking State, the question of poor performance by any State does not arise. That is one point. The second point, which is a very valid point, as mentioned by the hon. Member, is that sometimes the work does not take place at all on the ground, and Members of Parliament are questioned for not taking up the work; I understand that. The Ministry is continuously keeping track of all the States and reviewing every month the work done in the various States. My officers are talking to the district authorities and district officials concerned. A letter from a Member of Parliament is dealt with due care; we send it immediately to concerned officers and we also take care of the follow-up. Coming to the question of Assam, I would like to assure the hon. Member that if there is any problem, it would definitely be taken care of.

**SHRI URKHAO GWRA BRAHMA:** My second supplementary is that, in your Annexure, States have been ranked serially. My State figures somewhere in-between the 'best performers' and 'not so good performers'. In my question itself, I had asked for reasons for the poor performance; that has not been replied properly. The second thing is that, in your

statement, you say that you are fully satisfied with the performance of the MPLADS. Then, why are you not agreeing to an increase in the total allocation under the MPLAD fund?

**SHRI G.K. VASAN:** Sir, generally, we evaluate the scheme on the basis of utilisation of funds and the number of works completed. That is the method we follow.

Regarding enhancement, Sir, there has been a unanimous demand from Members of Parliament for an increase in the allocation of MPLAD fund, which definitely reflects the popularity of the scheme. The trend of increase in works that are recommended, the number of works sanctioned, the amount of funds released and the amount of funds utilised, show that, the scheme has been performing very well. But, Sir, at the moment, the Government is engaged in increasing the level of transparency and accountability under the scheme so that it can stand the test of time whether in the media or elsewhere. The budgetary allocation, as passed by the Parliament, for the year 2006-07 is Rs. 1580 crores, at the rate of Rs. 2 crores for each Member. At present, there is no proposal under the consideration of the Government to raise the fund.

**प्रो अलका शत्रिय:** सभापति महोदय, हम राज्य सभा के सांसद हैं इसलिए हम नोडल डिस्ट्रिक्ट्स के द्वारा पूरे राज्य में पैसा देते हैं। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि मेरा यह अनुभव है कि हम जो पैसा दूसरे डिस्ट्रिक्ट्स में भेजते हैं, वहां वह पैसा समय पर खर्च नहीं होता और वहां से हमें हिसाब भी नहीं दिया जाता। यहां से जो पैसा समय पर भेजना चाहिए, वह पैसा खर्च के हिसाब से भेजा जाता है। वे कहते हैं कि आपके वहां से हिसाब नहीं आया इसलिए हम पैसा नहीं भेज पाएंगे। मंत्री जी ने अपने जवाब में बताया है कि हमने राज्यों के अंदर समितियों का गठन किया है। मैं जानना चाहती हूँ कि ऐसे कौन से राज्य हैं जिन्होंने समितियों का गठन किया है और जिन राज्यों ने समितियों का गठन मॉनिटरिंग के लिए नहीं किया है, क्या केन्द्र सरकार वहां पर सीधे तौर पर मॉनिटरिंग के बारे में कोई व्यवस्था करने की सोच रही है? गुजरात के बारे में कृपया बता दीजिए क्योंकि आज तक हमारे यहां कोई मीटिंग नहीं हुई है।

**SHRI G.K. VASAN:** Sir, regarding Gujarat, I would like to inform the hon. Members that, last month, I was in Gujarat and I reviewed the situation so far as the MPLADS was concerned. Coming to the point of Utilisation Certificate or Audit Certificate, to which the hon. Member has referred, Sir, furnishing of these certificates for the year before the last was introduced from 2005-06 onwards. This is actually in order to further strengthen the financial discipline under the scheme. To bring the scheme on par with all

the other Central Government schemes as per the instructions of the Finance Ministry, we are following this very clearly. This criterion has not only improved the financial discipline at the ground level, but, I am proud to say, it has also given credibility and respectability to the scheme.

Coming to the point of having State-level monitoring committees, I would like to say that we are insisting on these State-level monitoring committees. I would say that, out of the 35 States, around 11 States have already constituted these committees. In another 10 to 11 States, these are in the process. On the 15th of December, I am having a review meeting with the Secretaries of the States. We will pursue the matter and see to it that these committees function efficiently.

श्री प्यारे लाल खंडेलवाल: सभापति महादेय, साधारणतया सांसद विकास निधि का पैसा अपने-अपने क्षेत्रों में खर्च करने का नियम है, लेकिन किसी विशिष्ट परिस्थिति में प्राकृतिक आपदा में, यह पैसा अन्य प्रांतों में भी खर्च करने का नियम है। महोदय, पिछली बार आपने सुनामी के समय सांसदों से यह अपील की थी कि यह पैसा सुनामी में पुनर्निर्माण करने के लिए खर्च किया जाए और सांसदों की निधि का यह पैसा उस क्षेत्र में दें। आपकी इस अपील पर मैंने दो करोड़ रुपया सुनामी क्षेत्र को दे दिया। जिसमें एक करोड़ तमिलनाडु को और एक करोड़ रुपया अंडमान निकोबार को दे दिया। बाद में मुझसे कहा गया कि यह सारा पैसा अंडमान को भेजना है, तो मैंने वह सारा पैसा अंडमान को दे दिया। मैंने इस राशि में से दो संस्थाओं के लिए पचास लाख रु० दिया था, जिसमें मैंने यह लिखकर भी बताया था कि सुनामी में जो स्वामी विवेकानन्द केन्द्र आश्रम का स्कूल नष्ट हो गया है, उसके भवन निर्माण के लिए 25 लाख रुपए हैं तथा जो वनवासी कल्याण आश्रम का भवन नष्ट हो गया है, उसके लिए 25 लाख रुपए हैं। महोदय, आज इतने लम्बे समय के बाद भी अभी तक वह पचास लाख रुपया, उन दोनों संस्थाओं को नहीं मिला है। मैंने इस बारे में माननीय मंत्री जी को एक पत्र भी लिखा है, मुझे जिसका जवाब भी ठीक से नहीं मिला है। महोदय, हमने आपकी अपील पर वह पैसा दिया और इतना लम्बा समय होने के बाद भी, वह पचास लाख रुपया सुनामी में नष्ट होने वाले उन दोनों संस्थाओं के भवनों के पुनर्निर्माण के लिए नहीं दिया गया है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब ऐसी परिस्थितियाँ होती हैं और ऐसे कठिन कार्यों के लिए आपत्तिकालीन कार्यों के लिए पैसा दिया जाता है, वह खर्च क्यों नहीं होता है और उसको खर्च क्यों नहीं करते? मैंने इस बारे में अंडमान के डिप्टी कमिश्नर को भी पत्र लिखा है नोडल जिला जहाँ से मेरा पैसा जाता है, छिंदवाड़ा के कलैक्टर ने भी पत्र लिखा है। सबको पत्र लिखने के बाद भी आज

स्थिति जहां की तहां है। अंत में मुझे मजबूर होकर लिखना पड़ा कि अगर सुनामी के काम में यह खर्च नहीं होगा तो मुझे यह पचास लाख रुपया वापस दे दीजिए।

श्री सभापति: ठीक है, ठीक है।

श्री प्यारे लाल खंडेलवाल: लेकिन आफिस से जवाब आ रहा है कि वह पैसा तो सरकार ने जो नियम बनाए हैं, उनके तहत सरकारी भवन बनाने के लिए खर्च किया जाएगा। मैं मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि इसके बारे में आपका उत्तर क्या है?

SHRI G.K. VASAN: Sir, the word 'tsunami' itself is a tragedy in the country. Many people have helped those people who faced problems during tsunami. The Members of Parliament who had given money for tsunami rehabilitation and reconstruction works under the MPLADS ... (Interruptions)... I would say 167 Rajya Sabha MPs gave their consent for an amount of ... (Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please come to his question.

SHRI G.K. VASAN: This is regarding tsunami. ... (Interruptions)... There are 73 MPLADS reconstruction works in the tsunami-affected areas of Andaman and Nicobar Islands and coastal areas of South India. ... (Interruptions)... I would like to submit that out of these works, ... (Interruptions)... The hon. Member wants details from me. ... (Interruptions)... Please listen to me ... (Interruptions)... As Minister, I have got the details to give to the House. ... (Interruptions)... I will get the details and give it to the hon. Member. ... (Interruptions)... Tsunami is a very important subject. ... (Interruptions)...

श्री सभापति: एक मिनट। ... (व्यवधान)... माननीय मंत्री जी, आप एक क्वेश्चन मेरा सुन लीजिए और उसका जवाब दे दीजिए कि इन्होंने जिस कार्य के लिए सुनामी के खाते में अपनी तरफ से एमपीलैड का पैसा दिया, उसमें खर्च न होकर सरकारी भवन बनाने में खर्च हुआ है। आप इसका जवाब दे दीजिए।

SHRI G.K. VASAN: Definitely, tsunami rehabilitation fund for Andaman and Nicobar Islands has been spent in consultation with the Rajya Sabha Committee and the UT Administration. ... (Interruptions)... Any further details required by the hon Member, I will submit it to him. ... (Interruptions)...

श्री प्यारे लाल खंडेलवाल: महोदय, यह पैसा किसमें खर्च करना है, यह निर्णय तो हमें करना है। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति: देख लेंगे, देख लेंगे। ... (व्यवधान)... Next question—227.